

INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE CELL

EXTERNAL PEER TEAM REVIEW REPORT

Academic Year	2024-2025
Date of Audit	14.11.2025

IQAC Peer Team Members for Review:

Sl. No.	Name	Designation & Address
1	Dr. G. Raja Vikram	Professor & Head, Department of Computer Science Engineering, Vignan Institute of Technology & Science, Hyderabad - 508284
2	Dr. N. Sudharsan	Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Vidya Jyothi Institute of Technology, Hyderabad - 500075
3	Dr. M. I. Thariq Hussan	Professor and Head, Department of Information Technology, Guru Nanak Institutions Technical Campus, Hyderabad - 501506

Institutional Information

1	Name and address of the college	Guru Nanak Institute of Technology, Hyderabad
2	Name of the affiliating University to which the College is Affiliated	JNTU, Hyderabad
3	Name of the Principal	Dr. K. Venkata Rao
4	Email ID	principal.gnit@gniindia.org
5	Contact Numbers	8096609821
6	List of Programmes offered	MBA and B.Tech in CE, ME, EEE, ECE, CSE, IT, AI & DS, AI & ML, and CSC.

New Programmes instituted during the year (if any) : Nil

CRITERION-WISE ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE

CRITERION I – PROFILE OF INSTITUTION

Criteria No.	Criteria Items	Verification (Yes/No)	Comments
1.1	Availability and verification of statutory compliance documents (including accreditation certificates, approval and sanction letters issued by competent authorities.)	yes	The institution continues to maintain complete statutory and regulatory compliance. The NAAC accreditation status, cycle and validity are clearly documented & communicated across departments. NBA accreditation details of eligible programmes are well maintained.
1.2	Status of NAAC accreditation (cycle, validity period, and the grade awarded to the institution)	yes	
1.3	Status of NBA accreditation of academic programmes (details of accredited courses, accreditation period, and current validity.)	yes	

CRITERION II – DETAILS OF STUDENTS' ADMISSION

Criteria No.	Criteria Items	Verification (Yes/No)	Comments
2.1	Process of student admission emphasizing quality and merit-based selection (including adherence to the approved admission policy and analysis of actual intake)	yes	The admission process remains transparent, merit-based, and strictly aligned with regulatory guidelines. The student information management system has been further strengthened since the previous review.
2.2	Student Information Management System (covering its structure, functionality, and role in maintaining student admission, academic, and administrative records)	yes	

CRITERION III – CURRICULAR ASPECTS

Criteria No.	Criteria Items	Verification (Yes/No)	Comments
3.1	Scheme of instruction, detailed syllabi, and Teaching-Learning Process (TLP) documents (outlining curriculum structure)	yes	schemes of instruction, syllabi, and Teaching-Learning process documents are well structured and

RND

[Signature]

[Signature]

	and delivery methods)		periodically reviewed.
3.2	Comprehensive documentation of courses offered (including programme structure, course objectives, and learning outcomes)	yes	course documentation remains comprehensive and systematic.
3.3	Academic Calendar planning and implementation (its relevance in organizing academic, curricular, and assessment activities)	yes	The Academic calendar is effectively planned and implemented.
3.4	Details and Minutes of Meetings (MoM) of statutory and academic bodies such as BOS, Academic Council, IAC, DAC (reflecting curriculum planning and governance)	yes	minutes of statutory and academic bodies reflect active participation and informed decision-making.
3.5	Academic Rules and Regulations (governing curriculum implementation, assessment, progression, and award of grades/degrees)	yes	Academic rules and regulations are clearly defined, disseminated and consistently implemented.
3.6	Integration of Swayam/Coursera and other certification courses as part of curriculum enrichment and skill development initiatives.	yes	Integration of swayam, coursera and other certification courses has expanded compared to previous year.
3.7	Students' and other stakeholders' feedback on curriculum	yes	structured feedback mechanisms from students & stakeholders are systematically implemented.

CRITERION IV – STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION

Criteria No.	Criteria Items	Verification (Yes/No)	Comments
4.1	Framework for Continuous Internal Evaluation (CIE) (specifying components, weightages, transparency measures, and adherence to approved academic regulations)	yes	The continuous Internal Evaluation system is robust and transparent.
4.2	Internal and external examination policy (approved by the Academic Council, outlining assessment methods, schedules, evaluation	yes	The internal and external examination policy is comprehensive and approved by the Academic council.







	procedures, and compliance with autonomy regulations)		
4.3	Examination conduct mechanisms (including flying squad arrangements, Examination Management System (EMS), examination grievance redressal process, and remedial measures)	yes	Examination conduct mechanisms function smoothly with effective EMS support.
4.4	Examination Manual (defining standard operating procedures for examinations, confidentiality, responsibilities of examination personnel, and regulatory compliance)	yes	The Examination manual clearly outlines SOPs and responsibilities.
4.5	Appointment and approval of examiners by the competent authority (question paper setting and evaluation, as per autonomy norms)	yes	Appointment of examiners follows approved autonomy norms.
4.6	Meetings and resolutions of the Board of Examiners (BoE) and Malpractice Enquiry Committee (including documentation and action taken reports)	yes	meetings and resolutions of the BoE & malpractice Enquiry committee are well documented.
4.7	Question paper setting procedures (ensuring syllabus coverage, learning outcome alignment, and confidentiality as prescribed under autonomous regulations)	yes	Question paper setting procedures ensure syllabus coverage and outcome alignment.
4.8	Preparation and notification of draft and final timetables (for Semester End Examinations in accordance with academic calendar provisions)	yes	Draft and final examination timetables are prepared and notified well in advance.
4.9	Approved scheme of evaluation and model answers (for uniformity and fairness in assessment of answer scripts)	yes	Approved schemes of evaluation and model answers ensure uniformity and fairness.
4.10	Decoding of answer scripts, valuation process, and	yes	Decoding, valuation, and SEE report generation

RUE

DR

DR

	generation of Semester End Examination (SEE) reports (as per prescribed norms)		follow prescribed norms.
4.11	Tabulation, scrutiny, and approval of examination results (by the designated authorities)	yes	Result tabulation and scrutiny are systematic and accurate.
4.12	Declaration of provisional results (within the stipulated timeline)	yes	Provisional results are declared within timelines.
4.13	Provision for obtaining photocopies of evaluated answer scripts and access to evaluation transparency mechanisms.	yes	provision for photocopies of evaluated answer scripts ensures transparency.
4.14	Regulations governing makeup examinations and revaluation, (including eligibility criteria and procedural compliance)	yes	makeup examination and revaluation regulations are clearly defined and implemented.
4.15	Preparation of eligibility lists, issue of grade cards and Provisional Degree Certificates (PDC), and recommendation of candidates for award of degree to the affiliating university, as applicable.	yes	Eligibility lists, grade cards, PDCs, and degree recommendations are prepared systematically.

CRITERION V – RESEARCH, INNOVATIONS AND EXTENSION

Criteria No.	Criteria Items	Verification (Yes/No)	Comments
5.1	Details of research funding received from various agencies and mechanisms for utilization, monitoring, and financial accountability.	yes	Research funding utilization and monitoring mechanisms are well documented.
5.2	Institutional networking and collaboration plan (proposed and ongoing teaching, research collaborations, MoUs, and academic partnerships)	yes	Institutional collaborations and MoUs are actively promoted.
5.3	Research and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) policy, (including provisions for innovation, patents, copyrights, technology transfer, and revenue	yes	The research and IPR policy is clearly defined and implemented.

	sharing)		
5.4	Other research promotion and consultancy activities (including industry interaction, sponsored projects, extension activities, and community-oriented research initiatives)	yes	Research promotion, consultancy, and extension activities are steadily growing.
5.5	Research achievements of faculty members (such as funded projects, patents filed/granted, awards, recognitions, and research supervision)	yes	Faculty research achievements are noteworthy.
5.6	Details of research publications, (including papers published in peer-reviewed journals, conference proceedings, books, book chapters, and citation metrics)	yes	Research publications are well documented with improved quality indicators.

CRITERION VI – GOVERNANCE, LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Criteria No.	Criteria Items	Verification (Yes/No)	Comments
6.1	Minutes of Meetings (MoM) of the Governing Body, Management Committee, and Finance Committee (reflecting policy decisions, financial oversight, and administrative governance)	yes	minutes of governing and statutory bodies reflect effective governance.
6.2	UGC Expert Committee report for grant of autonomous status (documentation of initiatives and reforms undertaken by the institution pursuant to autonomy)	yes	UGC Expert committee recommendations related to autonomy have been systematically implemented.
6.3	Department-wise details of teaching and non-teaching staff (including designation, qualifications, pay scale, experience, and appointment status)	yes	Department - wise faculty and staff details are comprehensive and updated.
6.4	Service rules, performance appraisal system, and other	yes	Service rules and appraisal systems are

	staff-centric welfare and development policies.		clearly defined.
6.5	Faculty recruitment policy and strategic staffing plan (aligned with institutional academic plans and regulatory requirements)	yes	Faculty recruitment policies are transparent and aligned with institutional planning.
6.6	Availability and management of financial resources for institutional development (including audited financial statements and budgetary provisions)	yes	Financial resources are managed transparently with audited statements

CRITERION VII – INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Criteria No.	Criteria Items	Verification (Yes/No)	Comments
7.1	Minutes of Meetings (MoM) of the Programme Advisory Committee (PAC), Department Advisory Board (DAB), and Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) (reflecting quality initiatives and academic monitoring)	yes	MoMs of PAC, DAB, and IQAC reflect active quality monitoring.
7.2	Formation and composition of the Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC)	yes	IQAC composition complies fully with prescribed norms.
7.3	Quality assurance initiatives undertaken through IQAC (including organization of Faculty Development Programmes (FDPs), workshops, seminars, and continuous improvement activities)	yes	IQAC initiatives such as FDPs, workshops, and quality audits are actively conducted.
7.4	Submission of Annual Quality Assurance Report (AQAR) to NAAC within the stipulated timelines and compliance with prescribed formats.	yes	AQAR submission is timely and compliant with NAAC formats.

RLL

QAM

Jij

SUMMARY OF THE IQAC EXTERNAL PEER TEAM REVIEW

1. Observations: The institution has shown steady improvement in academic, administrative, and governance practices compared to the previous peer review. The autonomous status has been used effectively to improve curriculum planning, outcome-based education, and examination processes. Teaching-learning methods, evaluation procedures, and quality assurance practices are generally well organized and followed across departments.

2. Suggestions / Comments / Recommendations for Improvement:

While good progress has been made, the peer team suggests greater efforts to obtain government research funding and to strengthen industry and international collaborations. Interdisciplinary research and consultancy activities need more focused support.

3. Conclusion: Overall, the institution has addressed many of the earlier peer review observations and shows a clear commitment to quality improvement under autonomous status. With continued focus on research, collaboration, and systematic quality enhancement, the institution is capable of achieving higher academic standards and greater institutional impact in the future.

Signatures of IQAC Peer Team Members:

Member1

Member2

Member3

14/11/25

8

Dr. Koduganti Venkata Rao
PRINCIPAL

Guru Nanak Institute of Technology
Ibrahimpatnam, R.R. Dist. Telangana-501 506.